REMARKS

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-26 are pending in this application. Applicants submit that no new matter is added by the present amendment.

Claims 1-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0116698 ("Lurie") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,973,647 ("Crudele"). Applicants respectfully traverse the above rejections.

Interview Summary

Applicants' undersigned representative, Mr. Eiferman, and Examiner Khanh Pham participated in a telephonic interview on June 26, 2007 to discuss the present claim amendments. Agreement was reached. Examiner Pham stated that the feature of storing a device database was not taught or suggested by the description of the Applicant admitted prior art in the specification of the present application.

Specification

The specification is hereby amended to correct informalities noted in the Office Action.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0116698 ("Lurie") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,973,647 ("Crudele"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claims 1, 9, 17 and 22 recite the feature of storing a device database in a device project. This enables the device database to be deployed to the device as part of the project rather than, for example, by manually copying the device database to the device.

Lurie discloses software packages that can be deployed to applications. However, Lurie does not teach or suggest that a device database may be stored in a device project and deployed to a device as part of the device project. Lurie does not in any way describe the deployment of a device database to a device. In fact, Lurie actually teaches away from deploying a device database to a device because Lurie discloses that mobile devices access

data stores that are external to the mobile devices themselves (see Lurie, Fig. 2, clearly depicting mobile devices 102 and 104 pulling data 206 from external data stores 120). Crudele similarly fails to teach or suggest that a device database may be stored in a device project and deployed to a device as part of the device project.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 9, 17 and 22 are patentable over the cited references. Applicants further submit that claims 2-8, 10-16, 18-21 and 23-36 are patentable at least by reason of their dependency. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections are respectfully requested.

<div align="center">

CONCLUSION

</div>

      In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: July 30, 2007   /Kenneth R. Eiferman/
                                                     Kenneth R. Eiferman
                                                     Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439